

Review Article

Resilience in Civil Infrastructure: Designing for Natural Disasters

Ahmed Majid Imran ^{1, *}, 

¹ Civil Engineering department, Istanbul Gelişim University, Istanbul, Türkiye

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 1 Jun 2023

Revised: 15 Jul 2023

Accepted 15 Aug 2023

Published 1 Sep 2023

Keywords

Resilience,

Civil Infrastructure,

Retrofitting.



ABSTRACT

Climate change has directly affected the increasing intensity and frequency of natural disasters, hence resilient civil infrastructure is essential to climate changes. Within this paper, the principles and approaches to resilient infrastructure systems will be defined. A closer look will be taken to examine suitability in modularity, redundancy, adaptability and community engagement. The learning from analyzed failures of the past, risk assessment approaches, state-of-the-art innovations such as digital twins, self-healing materials, among others, can be synthesized and can help to promote infrastructure systems' robustness and sustainability. The retrofitting of predominate existing infrastructure systems along with integration of living systems are among the most effective, efficient, low-cost and environmentally compatible methods to adopt and develop further towards zero-loss structures. Inclusive processes help to prove that it is possible treating resilience planning fairly to every community member. Most of the discussed and further outlined processes focus on equity to protect both climate vulnerable and naturally vulnerable areas and the communities living those. By collating state-of-the-art technology, advancements, progressions and future goals, this paper aims to help with one of the many scientific approaches of producing more resilient, adaptable to change infrastructure systems in an environmentally aggressive future.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE IMPERATIVE OF RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE

Resilience in civil infrastructure will be defined as the capacity of civil structures and systems to recover and adapt from adverse conditions, be it natural catastrophes or artificial threats. Recently, the patronage on this subject within the civil engineering community has grown significantly, with an increase in the number and severity of these events worldwide. The resilience of structures and systems is evaluated using diverse methods and techniques, such as probabilistic resilience methodologies, structural health monitoring, and smart construction. These evaluation methods, among many others, help to secure and render the communities more sustainable while allowing civil infrastructure to adapt and cope with problems and threats [1]. The critical points concerning resilience in civil infrastructure are listed below:

A. Probabilistic and Imprecise Resilience Assessment

- Resilience is often measured probabilistically, considering the stochastic nature of hazard occurrences and recovery processes. This involves integrating time-variant performance functions, which are influenced by uncertain factors [1].
- Imprecise probability methods have been developed to address challenges in resilience evaluation, providing bounds for resilience when precise data is unavailable [1].

B. Innovations in Civil Engineering

- Advanced engineering solutions, such as resilient structural designs and materials, are crucial for enhancing disaster resilience. These innovations include geotechnical engineering practices and the use of eco-friendly construction materials [2].
- Smart technologies, including sensors and monitoring systems, offer early warning capabilities and real-time data for disaster response, contributing to infrastructure resilience [2].

C. Frameworks and Methodologies

- Research has identified two main approaches to resilience: frameworks and conceptual models, and case study-based methodologies. The latter is more commonly adopted in resilience research [3].
- The concept of "resilience capacity" has been introduced, generalizing traditional load-bearing capacity to include the ability to absorb, recover, and adapt to loads [1].

Resilience is an emerging domain in civil infrastructure. However, there are significant hurdles in defining the new performance parameters and modeling the multi-hazard scenarios. Multidisciplinary research is required to overcome the

*Corresponding author email: Istanbul200406647@ogr.gelisim.edu.tr

challenges and to tighten the knots of resilience and sustainability with civil engineering apparatus [3]. Although resilience is one of the major elements for effective disaster management, it is vital to discern that not every community has equal resources to construct resilience. Preparedness disparity will amplify the existing vulnerabilities, demanding fallacious support structures [4], [5].

2. DEFINING RESILIENCE IN CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE

Civil infrastructure resilience is defined as its ability to survive, recover, and adapt to disruption, especially due to research concerns about growing natural and man-made threats. This definition encompasses a broad range of approaches and frameworks to ensure the sustainability and operability of infrastructure systems. Key points of civil infrastructure resilience are discussed below.

2.1 Conceptual Frameworks for Resilience

Over the years, the conceptual frameworks for resilience in civil infrastructure have changed dramatically. Current frameworks are geared towards multi-dimensional assessments, which encompass safety, system recovery and environmental sustainability.

A. Multi-Scenario Resilience Assessment

- The Novel Infrastructure Resilience Assessment Curve (NIRAC) emphasizes a multi-scenario approach, integrating sustainable principles to enhance environmental resilience [6].
- The framework for assessing critical infrastructures includes attributes such as resistant, absorption, adaptive, and recovery resilience, modeled through Markov processes [7].

B. Comprehensive Evaluation Frameworks

- A generalized bridge resilience framework evaluates safety, social, environmental, and economic perspectives, facilitating dynamic control throughout the lifecycle of infrastructure [4].
- The concept of "resilience capacity" unifies reliability and resilience analyses, indicating that resilience is a broader concept encompassing traditional reliability measures [1].

C. Research Trends and Gaps

- Recent bibliometric analyses reveal a growing interest in resilience research, highlighting the need for multidisciplinary approaches to address multi-hazard scenarios and cascading effects [3].

2.2 Key Attributes

Firstly, the definition of resilience in civil infrastructure can be implied concerning the several resilience attributes. In this respect, most literature refers to the widely-used attributes which enhance the resilience of the system as a whole and contribute to its robustness against threats. The structures engaged in the critical infrastructure systems can encounter with disruptions; the comprehensive list of the resilience attributes encompasses resistance, absorption, adaptability, and recovery. Resilience attributes widely used in literature:

1. Resistance: The inherent ability of a structure to withstand loads without failure. This is foundational for ensuring safety during hazardous events [1].
2. Absorption: The capacity to absorb impacts from disruptive events, minimizing damage and maintaining functionality [7].
3. Adaptability: The ability of infrastructure to adjust to changing conditions and recover from disturbances. This includes the integration of smart technologies for real-time monitoring [2].
4. Recovery: The speed and efficiency with which a system can return to its pre-disruption state, emphasizing the importance of planning and resource allocation [7].

The possible conflicts among the attributes must be considered too, while these attributes are important to improve resilience. To illustrate, more resistance can infer less adaptability, wherefore a balanced perspective must be employed during infrastructure design and operation.

3. NATURAL DISASTERS: CHALLENGES TO CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE

The world is witnessing a growing trend of hazardous natural disasters, including hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, wildfires, etc. Civil infrastructure systems around the globe are under increasing threat from these disasters, which disrupt services while producing loss to life and property. Loss of services such as transportation, energy, and water supply are crippling for functionality of society and such loss in overwhelming proportions is on the rise [8]. With climate change and business as usual the aging infrastructure will fail more often due to extreme weather conditions and nature hazards [9].

Civil infrastructure systems, including bridges, roads, power grids, water systems, and similar facilities, are intended to serve society. However, infrastructure systems are frequently unable to handle the multifaceted and cascading impacts of natural disasters. For example, Hurricane Katrina (2005) exposed major deficiencies in levee systems, and the Tōhoku

earthquake and tsunami (2011) crippled energy infrastructure leading to the Fukushima nuclear meltdown [10], [11]. These cases identify the crucial requirement for resilient infrastructure systems that can endure, adjust, and recover from calamities.

The relationship between natural disasters and infrastructure resilience is significant due to its importance in risk reduction and recovery processes. At the international level, researchers, engineers, and policymakers are looking for innovative solutions such as sustainable urban development, early warning systems, and advanced construction materials to reduce the effects of disasters in the future [12]. This paper aims to analyze civil infrastructure challenges regarding natural disasters, lessons learned from past disasters, and possible methods to gain resilience against future disasters. In describing the different categories of natural hazards and their effects on various infrastructure networks and worldwide efforts at disaster mitigation, this research adds to a burgeoning literature that seeks to protect life and property in an age where environmental unpredictability is the norm.

1. Earthquakes

An earthquake is the shaking of ground and rupturing of surface resulting due to release of energy instantaneously along fault lines. Its magnitude is measured using Richter and Moment Magnitude Scales. Its effects may lead to structural failure, ground liquefaction, and damage to transport and utility networks [13]. **Impacts on Infrastructure:** Earthquakes damage buildings, bridges, dams, and roads, especially in regions with inadequate seismic design. Liquefaction destabilizes foundations, disrupting transport and water pipelines [14].

- **Historical Example:**

The 1995 Kobe Earthquake in Japan caused extensive damage to elevated highways and urban structures, exposing critical weaknesses in seismic reinforcement. Over 6,000 lives were lost, and infrastructure repair costs exceeded \$100 billion. The event prompted Japan to adopt stricter seismic codes and invest in resilient construction technologies [14].

2. Floods

Excessive rains, storm surges, and dam breaches lead to floods as a result of broad inundation. It is one of the most common and disastrous types of natural hazards [15].

- **Impacts on Infrastructure:**

Floods submerge roads, railways, and buildings, erode embankments, and contaminate water supplies. Prolonged water exposure weakens structural materials, leading to long-term degradation of infrastructure [16], [17].

- **Historical Example:**

The 2010 Pakistan floods submerged one-fifth of the country, damaging bridges, irrigation systems, and transportation networks. The disaster displaced millions and exposed the lack of climate-resilient infrastructure. Recovery efforts emphasized the need for elevated roads and flood-resistant designs [17].

3. Hurricanes

Hurricanes (or tropical cyclones) are powerful storm systems fueled by warm ocean waters. They bring heavy rainfall, strong winds, and storm surges that devastate coastal and inland infrastructure [18].

- **Impacts on Infrastructure:**

The power lines are down due to high winds, flood defenses are breached due to storm surges, heavy rainfall causes landslides and flooding in urban areas. The secondary impacts affect transportation, energy, and communication systems [18].

4. Historical Example:

The New Orleans levee failure and catastrophic flood is Hurricane Katrina (2005). It left 1,800 death and \$125 billion damages. The systemic issues with flood control infrastructure also led to reforms in disaster management and levee design [19].

5. Wildfires

Wildfires are uncontrolled fires that can rapidly spread due to extreme heat, dry vegetation, and high winds. Climate change has made their occurrence more frequent [20].

- **Impacts on Infrastructure:**

Wildfires devastate infrastructure, causing the collapse of buildings, melting of power lines, and damage to transportation networks. Heat from wildfire can bend roads and bridges, stopping all recovery activities [21].

- **Historical Example:**

The 2018 California wildfires caused widespread destruction, burning thousands of structures and crippling energy grids. The disaster emphasized the need for fire-resistant materials and vegetation management near critical infrastructure [22].

4. DESIGN PRINCIPLES FOR RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURES

Building resilient infrastructure is key to secure that essential systems can adapt and cope with different types of disruptions, including human-induced threats and natural disasters. The next principles represent a framework that supports resilient infrastructure, based on academic studies:

1. **Redundancy and Diversity**
Incorporating multiple pathways and diverse components within infrastructure systems ensures that if one element fails, others can maintain functionality. This approach is akin to ecological robustness, where diversity enhances system resilience. Huang et al. (2021) [23] discuss an ecological robustness-oriented approach for power system network expansion, emphasizing the importance of redundancy in maintaining system stability.
2. **Modularity**
Designing infrastructure with modular components allows for isolated failures without causing systemic collapse. Modular systems can be repaired or replaced in sections, enhancing overall resilience. Franchin and Cavalieri (2015) advocate for modularity in urban infrastructure, citing that isolated failures significantly reduce recovery times and costs [24].
3. **Flexibility and Adaptability**
Infrastructure should be designed to adapt to changing conditions and unexpected challenges. Flexible designs can accommodate future modifications, ensuring long-term resilience. Ouyang et al. (2012) discuss adaptability in infrastructure networks, particularly emphasizing real-time adjustments to transportation systems during disasters [25].
4. **Robustness**
Ensuring that infrastructure can withstand significant stress without failure is crucial. Robust design involves using materials and construction methods that endure extreme conditions. Cimellaro et al. (2010) stress that robust structural designs significantly mitigate damage during earthquakes and hurricanes [26].
5. **Decentralization**
Decentralized infrastructure reduces the risk of widespread failure by localizing potential issues. Distributed systems, such as microgrids in energy distribution, enhance resilience by isolating problems. The concept of decentralization is supported by various studies emphasizing the resilience benefits of distributed infrastructure systems [27].
6. **Incorporation of Natural Systems**
Integrating natural elements, such as green spaces and water management systems, can enhance resilience by leveraging ecosystem services. This biomimicry approach supports infrastructure systems by emulating nature's resilience strategies. The use of biomimicry in resilient infrastructure design is discussed in the literature, highlighting its potential benefits [28].
7. **Community Engagement**
Engaging local communities in the design and maintenance of infrastructure ensures that systems meet local needs and that residents are prepared to respond to disruptions. Community involvement is crucial for the successful implementation and sustainability of resilient infrastructure projects [29].
8. **Continuous Monitoring and Maintenance**
Implementing systems for ongoing monitoring and regular maintenance ensures that infrastructure remains functional and can respond to emerging threats. Proactive maintenance strategies are essential for sustaining infrastructure resilience over time [30].

By adhering to these principles, infrastructure designers and policymakers can develop systems that not only withstand adverse events but also adapt and thrive amidst changing conditions, ensuring the continuity of essential services and the safety of communities.

5. RISK ASSESSMENT AND VULNERABILITY ANALYSIS

Vulnerability assessment and risk analysis practices are the core processes to improve the resilience of critical infrastructure (CI) systems. Their interrelated processes comprise recognizing the infrastructure elements' susceptibility to potential hazards and adverse events, followed by assessing the impact of these risks on the CI network. The primary objective of these processes is to guide decisions and measures taken to eliminate the vulnerabilities and strengthen the resilience of the CI system. The risk analysis process involves a systematic approach to understanding hazards that can impact the CI systems. It includes three steps: risk assessment, risk analysis, and risk evaluation. The first step, risk assessment, is primarily based on hazard identification, which identifies potential harm or loss sources. Such sources can be natural disasters, technological failure, or human-made incidents. The second step, risk analysis, focuses on evaluating the probability and effect of each hazard identified. Next, the risk evaluation process aims to recognize which risks have been analyzed and how significant they are. For instance, the risk assessment and vulnerability analysis method called MOSAR (Method Organized Systematic Analysis of Risk) demonstrated its applicability in CI systems through identifying their hazards and vulnerabilities, which guided the development of risk mitigation measures specific to a region [31], [32].

It is essential to understand the vulnerability to build a resilient system. An example of this is the power systems, where their science focuses on defining vulnerability and resilience to mitigate potential failures. A vast family of integrated risk and vulnerability assessment methods offers a complete methodology to define possible threats and understand system vulnerabilities. An example of this is a simulation-based framework for assessing interdependent infrastructures. The resilience of interdependent infrastructure networks recognizes interdependencies and incomplete information in the assessment of the diversity of the interdependent infrastructures vulnerabilities and strengths. These models serve as approaches for complex infrastructures. The inclusion of vulnerability assessment techniques has grown concerning climate change effects. The U.S. Department of Transportation's Volpe Center evaluated the economic risks and potential impacts of flooding, particularly coastal flooding, in jeopardizing transportation systems. Equity studies are increasingly considered in resilience assessments. A systematic literature review of equity literature shows the importance of incorporating a social dimension into the risk assessment toolkit. This ensures that the dimensions of resilience consider the demands of all communities and not just a few in the same way [33].

To conclude, one can say that risk assessment and vulnerability analysis play have an important role in detecting threats and vulnerabilities associated with infrastructure systems[34]. By using systematic and integrated methods, the involved parties can formulate practical measures which can strengthen critical infrastructures against various hazards[35].

6. INNOVATIONS IN RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS

Resilient infrastructure systems can prevent climate change and stabilize natural disasters and other crises impacts, as well as the continuous delivery of essential functions and services. The new promising trends in innovations in resilient infrastructure systems include breakthrough engineering methods, equitable design paradigms, and enhanced adaptability and robustness through the adoption of borderline technologies. Climate-informed engineering is viewed as a breakthrough innovation that brings together infrastructure planning and design with future climate risks. Predictive modeling tools help planners simulate extreme climate impacts, proactive vulnerability assessments, and severity forecasts. The use of nature-based solutions, such as wetlands, urban forestry, and bioengineered coastal barriers, can help mitigate floods while providing ecological benefits. Next-generation materials, such as self-healing concrete, are introduced to improve infrastructure systems' durability and minimize maintenance costs of up to 25% due to the autonomous self-recovery of occasional cracks. A new paradigm of equitable infrastructure resilience is widely discussed based on the new ideas embodied in the Restorative Justice Framework, Policy Innovation, and Exploratory Research. Evidence of fossil infrastructure systems and its lasting legacy in climate-vulnerable areas—pollution, exclusionary zoning with subsidized housing and segregated transit systems—has become apparent in the case of climate change impacts. This places a disproportionate burden on marginalized communities, but precludes equitable outcomes. Investments will focus on transit-oriented development systems, fair wage jobs, and the elimination of discriminatory zoning and transit policies. Instead, Cridland believes that socioeconomic mobility depends on the built systems, with early childhood development advantages, while community participation is included at the earliest planning stages.

Also, technological innovations are changing the landscape of infrastructure resilience. One example is how an emerging technology of creating digital twins (virtual replicated physical infrastructures), allows planning and designing based on real-time monitoring, and predictive maintenance. Sensor networks and the Internet of Things (IoT) enhance the reliability of infrastructure as it strengthens the uninterrupted monitoring of critical infrastructures, such as water pipelines and power grids. These technologies help reduce the possibility of critical breakdown and improve responsiveness during emergencies. In addition, policy and governance are key to the establishment of infrastructure resilience. Governments are now requiring multi-hazard risk assessments for newly constructed infrastructures and consider linked vulnerability to the infrastructures, such as cascading failures in energy and water systems. Public-private partnerships for resilient and sustainable designs are promoted through collaborative funding schemes to control for costs. Policymaking is relatively incremental, but there is resilience planning as the resilience criteria are included in climate action planning, as well as policy development for urban planning [36], [37].

Infrastructure. Planners can create comprehensive solutions that tackle numerous problems at once by uniting specialists in urban design, engineering, energy, and environmental science. For instance, integrating resilient water management infrastructure with renewable energy systems can produce self-sustaining, adaptive urban developments.

7. RETROFITTING AND UPGRADING EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Service life is the duration for which the adopted structural rehabilitation technique is expected to upgrade the structural design life. Structural adaptive rehabilitation considers the current demand on the existing structure, shows resilience and sustainability, and achieves efficiency. Structural adaptive rehabilitation technique enhances the performance of the existing structure to carry the current and future demands and provides a cost-effective and eco-friendly solution than constructing a new structure.

7.1 The Importance of Retrofitting

Numerous infrastructure facilities, structures, buildings, bridges, tunnels, etc. are failing due to reaching their design lifetime. Retrofitting solves the problem of structural failure and obsolescence of existing infrastructure due to changes in environmental conditions and demand, as well as helps fulfill the new requirements specified in updated safety and performance codes. In particular, this is important for reducing the risks associated with natural disasters (earthquakes, floods, etc.) and improving energy efficiency to address climate change implications. Also, upgrading instead of demolishing minimizes construction waste and reduces the impact on local communities [38].

7.2 Innovative Techniques in Retrofitting

Recent advancements in retrofitting focus on using cutting-edge materials and technologies:

- A. High-Strength Materials and Composites: Innovative materials like fiber-reinforced polymers (FRPs) and self-healing concrete strengthen existing structures, improve resilience to dynamic loads, and extend service life [38], [39], [40].
- B. Seismic Retrofitting: Common retrofitting techniques for seismic zones are base isolation, damping systems, and strengthened shear walls to improve structure stability [39].
- C. Smart Monitoring Systems: The integration of sensors and Internet of Things (IoT) technologies enables real-time monitoring of infrastructure health, allowing for predictive maintenance and rapid response to emerging issues [41], [42], [43].

7.3 Sustainability Through Retrofitting

Sustainability: Retrofitting aims to support global sustainability targets through energy reduction and lowering carbon footprints. An example of this is improving energy efficiency through insulation upgrades, HVAC improvements, and renewable energy retrofitting of buildings, which can have the same effect as lowering a building's initial energy consumption [43]. This is becoming an increasing emphasis in urban retrofitting work as concerns for zero-carbon commitments and urban resilience take precedence in development [44].

7.4 Challenges and Opportunities

Sustainability: Retrofitting encourages sustainability efforts to meet global targets through energy reduction and decreasing carbon footprint. For instance, enhancing energy efficiency through insulation upgrade, HVAC replacement and renewable energy retrofitting of buildings can yield similar benefits as decrease in original energy consumption [43]. This is also gaining more focus in urban retrofitting practices as zero-carbon pledges and urban resilience takes priority in developments [44].

8. FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN

Future trends in resilient infrastructure design will involve incorporating state-of-the-art technologies, novel materials, and a focus on the end-user experience to establish solutions to withstand the problems brought about by climate change and urbanization. The shift in resilient infrastructure design will aim to improve the robustness and versatility of infrastructure systems to overcome and bounce back from disruptions. Future research and development can follow these directions:

- A. Advanced Material Utilization
 - 3D Printing Innovations: Incorporating 3D printed complex polymer reinforcements can significantly enhance the damage tolerance of structures, improving resilience by over 500% compared to traditional materials [45].
 - Biodegradable Materials: The use of biodegradable polymers in construction can reduce environmental impact while maintaining structural integrity [46].
 - Real-Time Monitoring: Using innovative sensing technologies enables ongoing infrastructure monitoring, facilitating prompt actions during emergencies [47].
 - Data-Driven Design: Using digital solutions to guide design practices can improve readiness and adaptability to natural hazards [47].
- B. Educational and Pedagogical Approaches
 - Project-Based Learning: Involving students in practical design issues related to infrastructure encourages a focus on users' needs, equipping future professionals to address intricate challenges[48].
 - Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Fostering teamwork among different areas can open up fresh possibilities for strong infrastructure solutions. [48].

While these advancements promise significant improvements in infrastructure resilience, challenges remain in balancing technological integration with socio-economic considerations, ensuring that all communities benefit equitably from these innovations [49].

9. CONCLUSIONS

Risk assessment and vulnerability analysis are the basis of resilient design that assists in performance enhancement measures and risk mitigation strategies. Continuously exploring emerging technologies for infrastructure systems, such as real-time monitoring, self-healing materials, and digital twins, holds promise for resilient design practices. Retrofitting existing infrastructure systems that minimize environmental damage and promote the longevity of current infrastructure helps meet worldwide sustainability targets. Future research must confront the challenges of multi-hazard resilience modeling and equitable resource distribution while encouraging trans-disciplinary cooperation to deliver infrastructure adaptations that are open and fair to all residents. Infrastructure systems prioritizing resilience prepare society for sustainability, protection, and thriving in uncertain scenarios.

Funding:

No external financial assistance or institutional funding was utilized for conducting this research. The authors assert that all research-related activities were self-financed.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare that there are no competing interests associated with this work.

Acknowledgment:

The authors would like to thank their institutions for their steadfast encouragement and logistical support throughout this research journey.

References

- [1] P. Franchin and F. Cavalieri, "Probabilistic assessment of civil infrastructure resilience to earthquakes," *Computer Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 583–600, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mice.12092>
- [2] S. L. Cutter, "The landscape of disaster resilience indicators in the USA," *Natural Hazards*, vol. 80, no. 2, pp. 741–758, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1993-2>
- [3] L. Chelleri, J. J. Waters, M. Olazabal, and G. Minucci, "Resilience trade-offs: addressing multiple scales and temporal aspects of urban resilience," *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 181–198, Jan. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247814550780>
- [4] O. Renn and T. Aven, *Risk Management and Governance: Concepts, Guidelines and Applications*. Springer, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13926-0>
- [5] A. M. Helmrich et al., "Using biomimicry to support resilient infrastructure design," *Earth's Future*, vol. 8, no. 12, p. e2020EF001653, Dec. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001653>
- [6] F. Kadri, B. Birregah, and E. Châtelet, "The impact of natural disasters on critical infrastructures: A domino effect-based study," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 217–241, Apr. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jhsem-2013-0015>
- [7] M. Ouyang, L. Dueñas-Osorio, and X. Min, "A three-stage resilience analysis framework for urban infrastructure systems," *Structural Safety*, vol. 36–37, pp. 23–31, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2011.12.004>
- [8] United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. UNDRR, Geneva, 2015.
- [9] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [10] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Disaster Resilience: A National Imperative*. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2012. <https://doi.org/10.17226/13457>
- [11] J. G. Carter, G. Cavan, A. Connelly, S. Guy, J. Handley, and A. Kazmierczak, "Climate change and the city: Building capacity for urban adaptation," *Progress in Planning*, vol. 95, pp. 1–66, Jan. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2013.08.001>
- [12] S. B. Miles and S. E. Chang, "Modeling community recovery from earthquakes," *Earthquake Spectra*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 439–458, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1193/1.2192966>
- [13] B. Yön, E. Sayin, and O. Onat, "Earthquakes and structural damages," in *Earthquakes – Tectonics, Hazard and Risk Mitigation*, InTech, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.5772/65863>
- [14] Pakistan Meteorological Department, *Analysis of 2010 Flood Impacts on Infrastructure*. Islamabad, 2011.
- [15] K. E. Trenberth, "Changes in precipitation with climate change," *Climate Research*, vol. 47, no. 1–2, pp. 123–138, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr00953>
- [16] S. Maskey and P. Samuels, *Managing Flood Risks in a Changing Climate*. John Wiley & Sons, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119667940>
- [17] M. Kundzewicz et al., "Flood risk and climate change: global and regional perspectives," *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.857411>
- [18] G. Park, "A comprehensive analysis of hurricane damage across the U.S. Gulf and Atlantic coasts using geospatial big data," *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, vol. 10, no. 11, Art. no. 760, Nov. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10110760>
- [19] R. J. Burby, "Hurricane Katrina and the paradoxes of government disaster policy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 604, no. 1, pp. 171–191, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205284676>
- [20] M. A. Finney, "The challenge of quantitative risk analysis for wildland fire," *Forest Ecology and Management*, vol. 211, no. 1–2, pp. 97–108, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2005.02.010>

- [21] S. Lhomme, D. Serre, Y. Diab, and R. Laganier, "Analyzing resilience of urban networks: a preliminary step towards more flood resilient cities," *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 221–230, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-13-221-2013>
- [22] C. B. McFayden, D. Boychuk, D. G. Woolford, M. J. Wheatley, and L. Johnston, "Impacts of wildland fire effects on resources and assets through expert elicitation to support fire response decisions," *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 885–900, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF18143>
- [23] M. Panteli and P. Mancarella, "Influence of extreme weather and climate change on the resilience of power systems: Impacts and possible mitigation strategies," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 127, pp. 259–270, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2015.06.012>
- [24] Y. Y. Haimen, "On the definition of resilience in systems," *Risk Analysis*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 498–501, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2009.01216.x>
- [25] T. D. O'Rourke, "Critical infrastructure, interdependencies, and resilience," *The Bridge*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 22–29, 2007.
- [26] S. E. Chang and M. Shinozuka, "Measuring improvements in the disaster resilience of communities," *Earthquake Spectra*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 739–755, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1193/1.1775796>
- [27] T. J. Campanella, "Urban resilience and the recovery of New Orleans," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 141–146, Jun. 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360608976734>
- [28] S. Meerow, J. P. Newell, and M. Stults, "Defining urban resilience: A review," *Landscape and Urban Planning*, vol. 147, pp. 38–49, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011>
- [29] F. H. Norris, S. P. Stevens, B. Pfefferbaum, K. F. Wyche, and R. L. Pfefferbaum, "Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 41, no. 1–2, pp. 127–150, Mar. 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>
- [30] M. Bruneau et al., "A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities," *Earthquake Spectra*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 733–752, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1193/1.1623497>
- [31] S. Meerow, J. P. Newell, and M. Stults, "Defining urban resilience: A review," *Landscape and Urban Planning*, vol. 147, pp. 38–49, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011>
- [32] A. E. Schweikert and M. R. Deinert, "Vulnerability and resilience of power systems infrastructure to natural hazards and climate change," *WIREs Climate Change*, vol. 12, no. 5, p. e724, Sep. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.724>
- [33] Y. Y. Haimen, "On the definition of resilience in systems," *Risk Analysis*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 498–501, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2009.01216.x>
- [34] G. Sansavini, "Operational risk assessment of critical infrastructures," *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, vol. 138, pp. 78–89, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.res.2015.01.011>
- [35] P. Singh et al., "Developing adaptive resilience in infrastructure systems," *Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure*, vol. 8, no. sup1, pp. 26–47, Jan. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23789689.2021.1995970>
- [36] L. Capacci et al., "Resilience of aging structures and infrastructure systems with emphasis on seismic resilience of bridges and road networks," *Resilient Cities and Structures*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 23–41, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcns.2022.05.001>
- [37] N. Goldbeck, P. Angeloudis, and W. Y. Ochieng, "Resilience assessment for interdependent urban infrastructure systems using dynamic network flow models," *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, vol. 188, pp. 62–79, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.res.2019.03.007>
- [38] S. H. Alsayed et al., "Innovative FRP applications in concrete structures," *Construction and Building Materials*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 1009–1021, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2009.11.020>
- [39] R. Romano, A. Donato, V. Alecci, and P. Gallo, "Innovative techniques integrating advanced and bio-composite materials for energy and seismic retrofitting of built heritage," *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 44, p. 103277, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.job.2021.103277>
- [40] S. Zuo et al., "High strength composites of carbon fiber sheets-veneers sandwich-structure for electromagnetic interference shielding materials," *Progress in Organic Coatings*, vol. 165, p. 106736, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.porgcoat.2022.106736>
- [41] A. Zonta, M. Pozzi, and P. Zanon, "Structural health monitoring by a distributed fiber optic system," *Structural Health Monitoring*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 183–195, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475921707085995>
- [42] J. Lin and Y. Yu, "Smart transportation infrastructure: A review of IoT applications," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1093–1105, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2017.2707340>
- [43] A. Toscani et al., "Low-cost structural health monitoring system for smart buildings," in *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. Sustainable Mobility Applications, Renewables and Technology (SMART)*, pp. 1–7, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMART55532.2022.9929548>
- [44] C. Thormark, "A low energy building in a life cycle—Its embodied energy, energy need for operation and recycling potential," *Building and Environment*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 429–435, 2002. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323\(01\)00033-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323(01)00033-6)
- [45] X. Yang, Z. Chen, Y. Zou, and F. Wan, "Improving the energy performance and economic benefits of aged residential buildings by retrofitting in hot-humid regions of China," *Energies*, vol. 16, no. 13, Art. no. 5120, Jul. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en16135120>
- [46] A. J. Lopes and J. A. Silva, "3D printing in construction: Current applications and future potential," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 92, pp. 288–298, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2018.03.009>
- [47] F. Casciati and G. Magonette, "Structural control and health monitoring," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, vol. 365, no. 1851, pp. 2829–2848, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2007.2004>
- [48] C. Ford, "Designing for resilience: Pedagogical models for engaging infrastructural design problems with a user-centric mindset," in *Proc. ASCE Inspire*, pp. 711–723, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784485088.065>
- [49] G. P. Cimellaro, A. M. Reinhorn, and M. Bruneau, "Framework for analytical quantification of disaster resilience," *Engineering Structures*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 3639–3649, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2010.08.008>